REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 19-48 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 6, 9-12, and 15-18 were previously canceled in a prior Office Action Response. No claims are amended.

The Advisory Action of January 24, 2005 (paper 1/05), item 5, explains that the "network including a destination device and an input device, wherein said destination device is external and separate from said input device" recited in the preamble, is not being given patentable weight because a "preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight <u>where it merely recites the</u> ***purpose of a process*** <u>or the</u> ***intended use of a structure***<u>, and where the body of the claims</u> ***does not depend on*** <u>the preamble</u> <u>for completeness</u>". Applicants agree, but respectfully point out that the preamble of claim 1 does <u>NOT</u> merely recite the purpose of a process or intended use of a structure, and furthermore point out that the body of claim 1 <u>DOES</u> depend on the preamble for completeness. Specifically, the preamble of claim 1 recites, inter alia, "a destination device and an input device, wherein said destination device is external and separate from said input device". This is a structural recitation and <u>not</u> a mere statement of purpose or intended use, as is asserted by the Advisory Action. Furthermore, each and every paragraph in the body of claim 1 makes reference to one or both of "said destination device" or "said input device" for completeness. Thus, in accordance with the Examiner's statement of reasons for when it is proper to ignore a recitation in the preamble, it is clear that the present claim 1 does not fall under any of the recited criteria under which elements in the preamble may be ignored. Therefore, Applicants once again urge the Examiner to consider all claim elements and their recited interaction.

In item 6, the Advisory Action once again asserts that Applicant's argument is that Unno does not teach "the file format (i.e. jpeg, bitmap, etc)", and that Unno teaches "converting file/data into a format that allowed to be transmitted in relation to the respective destination as shown in col. 6, lines 28-43, col. 10, lines 40-49, col. 14, lines 21-39".

Applicants repeat that our argument is NOT that Unno does not teach the use of file formats such as jpeg, bitmap, etc, and further request that our true argument, as explained in detail in previous Office Action responses, please be considered. Applicants have previously already conceded that Unno shows the use of different file formats, and shows the conversion between different file formats. However, Applicants do not claim to have invented the use of different file formats, nor the idea of converting a file from a first format to another. Rather, as is recited at least in claims 29 and 44, the present invention recites the conditional retrieval of a document based on a determination of the document's file format. Specifically, clams 29 and 44 state,

> "wherein prior to retrieving said image data, said client device submits a preferred file format to said image input device, and retrieves said image data only if said image data is in said preferred file format".

By contrast, the cited Unno excerpts state,

> col. 6, lines 28-43
> "... An image rotation unit 2030 is used to rotate image data and an image compression/decompression unit 2040 performs compression/decompression on image data according to the JPEG standard from multi-level image data and according to the JBIG, MMR, or MH technique for two-level image data."

Clearly, the above excerpt does not teach or suggest a conditional retrieval of a file based on its format. Continuing with...

> col. 10, lines 40-49,
> "In FIG. 12, reference numeral 1502 denotes an address book which is a database module for managing the destination of data. In accordance with the operation information given by the UI 1501, data is added, deleted, and/or acquired to/from the address book 1502 thereby giving information about the data destination specified by the user to various modules which will be described later. The address book stores data representing the **data** formats, the types of images allowed to be transmitted, and the resolutions, in relation to the respective destinations".

The above excerpt explains that the address book maintains a listing of data formats a possible recipient machine expects (i.e. line printer, post script printer, fax machine, etc.), type of images allowed, resolution (such as 600 dpi laser

printer vs. 4800 dpi ink jet printer), and other characteristics supplied a software device driver. This excerpt, however, makes no mention of <u>file</u> formats (i.e. jpeg, etc.), nor does it make any reference to a receiver making conditional retrievals of a file based on its file format. The last excerpt cited in the Advisory Action states,

> col. 14, lines 21-39

> "In the case where a destination device is a server capable of communicating via the SLM, the address of the server and the designated folder in the server are detected from the address book 4051, and image data (two-level image data) obtained via a scanner is compressed according to the MMR technique and converted into the TIFF (Tagged Image File Format) form, as in the remote copy application. The resultant image data is stored in a particular folder of the server connected to the network (4500)".

The above excerpt merely states that image data obtained by a scanner is compressed into a TIFF format, and stored in folder. As it is known in the art, the vast majority of scanners compress scanned files into a TIFF format. The only point of interest is that the above excerpt appears to provide a default storage folder for the scanned image. Irrespective, this excerpt again makes no mention of any conditional <u>retrieving</u> of a file based on its file format, as is required in the present invention.

Lastly, the Advisory Action makes reference to rejections made in the Office Action mailed January 6, 2005 in regards to prior art U.S. Pat. 6,437,875 to Unno, U.S. Pat. 5,689,642 to Harkins et al., and U.S. Pat. 6,219,151 to Manglapus et al. In the Office Action of January 6, 2005, Item 5 states that "Harkins ... teach[es] identifying an address of a remote storage device as shown in figures 1-3, col. 8, lines 29-54, col. 19, lines 62-col. 20 lines 54", and item 11 states that "Manglapus teaches the printer sends an acknowledgement and SNMP traps to client indicating the location of stored print jobs (figures 4-5)". This rejection appears to be overlooking the data transfer sequence recited in the claims. That is, it appears to overlook the claim limitations of *who* sends an address, *who* retrieves a file, and the relationship of the provided address identifying a remote storage location.

Perhaps before noting the differences, it may be helpful to first briefly summarize the newly cited prior art, and the cited excerpts. Firstly in regards to Harkins, this reference is very similar to that of Unno. Harkins explains that there are many methods, i.e. modes, of sending information, such as printers, fax machines, email, video display, etc. (see Harkin Fig. 1), and different people prefer to receive information in different specific methods. Some people may prefer paper copies while others prefer electronic files, while still others may prefer screen/video messages. In the Harkins network, each user on the network can fill out a form specifying the method of how that user prefers to receive information (i.e. by email, to a specific black and white printer, to a specific color printer, to a specific fax machine, etc.). Thus, when a first user identifies a second user to whom information is to be sent (Fig. 2), the server automatically routes the information to the user's preferred method of receiving information (Figs. 4 and 5). Thus, in the Harkins reference, a user must first fill out a generic preference form and submit it to a server for future use. Whenever information is to be sent to a particular user, the server determines if a preference form is filled out for the particular user, and if it is, then it provides the preferred method for receiving information.

Returning now to the cited excerpts, in regards to col. 8, lines 29-54, Applicants are at a loss to determine the relevance of most of this excerpt since most of it (lines 29-46) is merely a recitation of appendix, component parts, and modules in a network with no recitation of their interaction. As to lines 47-54, this section is a summary of Harkins' proposal for filling out a form listing a user's preferred method for receiving information, as explained above. Specifically, col. 8, lines 47-54 state,

> "Communication channel control begins with the receiver defining the preferred form(s) that documents should take when received. The user activates profile 150, shown in FIG. 4, by selecting display user profile command (not shown) from the network administration menu 47. User profile 150 is completed by a user, for example Fred Smith, and published to network administration 105 using the publish command 151 on the profile herald bar 152".

The filling out of this form is quite involved and its detailed explanation (Fig. 6) is described in col. 9, line 30 to col. 10 line 7. The above excerpt, however, is just half of the process. After a user fills out and sends the preference form to the server (i.e. publishes his/her preferences), any other user who wishes to send him/her information will be able to do so in his/her preferred form. The process for sending information to a receiver who has previously filled out a preference form is explained in col. 10, line 65 to col. 11, line 26.

As to excerpt "col. 19, line 62 to col. 20 lines 54" cited in the Office Action of January 6, 2005, Applicants respectfully point out that the Harkins patent only has 14 columns of text, and thus Applicants cannot identify the intended excerpt. Please let us know if the excerpt citation was mistyped.

In reference to the second cited reference, Manglapus explains (Fig. 2) that when a user 14 sends a print job to a print server (i.e. spooler 12) and the spooler 12 forwards the print job to a printer 24, typically the spooler handles all communications with the user 14. However, it would be helpful for the printer 24 to be able to send status updates (i.e. traps) of the submitted print job directly to the user 14 without having to use the spooler as the intermediary. In this case, the printer would traditionally have to obtain the user's address from the spooler 12, but this delays the transmission. In the process put forth by Manglapus, the user 14 inserts its own address into the print job file that it sends to the spooler 12. In this way, when the spooler forwards the print job to the printer 24, the printer can extract the user's address and transmit any status updates directly to the user 14 without having to request the address from the spooler 2.

The Office Action asserts that "Manglapus teaches the printer sends an acknowledgement and SNMP traps to client indicating the location of stored print jobs (figures 4-5)." This is incorrect. The flow chart of Fig. 4 illustrates the insertion of the user's address into a print job file and the extraction/parsing of information from the print job file, as is explained in Col. 7, lines 24-37. Specifically, steps 100-120 are executed by the workstation, and steps 135-160 are executed by the printer. Fig. 5 is a another recitation of the process for inserting the workstation's own address into the print job file, as is explained in

col. 9, lines 26-53. Thus, neither of these figures teach or suggest sending addresses to a client indicating the location of stored print jobs. The print jobs are executed at the printer (i.e. the printer prints the print jobs), and the client merely receives status updates regarding the execution of the print job. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner specify where Manglapus states that the printer sends to the client indications locating a stored print job, and further explain why a printer would ever send a print job to a client, who submitted the print job in the first place.

In summary, the Harkins reference shows a server that maintains a list of delivery preferences for multiple users, and when information is to be sent to a specific user, the specific user's preferred printer, fax machine, email address, etc. is automatically identified to receive the information. In the Manglapus reference, the client that submits a print job identifies itself to the printer so that the printer can send it status updates (i.e. traps). Both of these reference are very different from the claimed invention.

In the Harkins reference, there is no interaction between the recipient and the sender. Rather, the recipient submits a list of preferred delivery methods to a server, and the server is in charge of routing any transmitted information to the preferred delivery method. By contrast the present invention does not require, or utilize, a server. Rather in claim 1, the destination device submits directly to the input device an address identifying a remote storage location on the network. Upon receiving the address, the input device itself sends the input data to the identified remote storage device, and then proceeds to notify the destination device. By contrast in the Harkins reference, the client (i.e. input device) does not receive an address, nor does it send its input data directly to a specified remote storage location. Rather in the Harkins reference, after the client has selected a recipient, the server looks up the recipients preference form and automatically routs (i.e. creates a "channel" for) the information to the preferred receiving method. Furthermore, the present invention additionally requires that the destination device respond to the input device's notification that it has sent the input data to the remote storage

location, by then retrieving the input data directly from the remote storage location.

In the Manglapus reference the client (i.e. input device) submits <u>its own</u> address along with a print job to a printer server (i.e. spooler), which places the print job in queue for submission to a printer. When the print job is submitted to the printer (i.e. destination device), the printer extract the client's address and send it status updates regarding the execution of the submitted print job. Not only does Manglapus require the use of a network server, i.e. printer spooler, Manglapus makes no mention of a remote storage location, nor the use of an address for identifying the remote storage location, nor the retrieval of input data from the remote storage location. Thus, Applicants are at a loss to determine the relevance of the Manglapus reference in regards to the presently claimed invention.

As to the Unno reference, it appears to be cited merely to show that it is known that an input device, a destination device, and a remote storage location may coexist on a network, but Unno does not teach nor suggest the specific data transfer sequence recited in the present claims.

Thus, the present invention is not taught or suggested, singularly or in combination, by the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rosalio Haro
Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Customer No. 20178
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: February 22, 2005